

Decision _____

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider
Whether Text Messaging Services are
Subject to Public Purpose Program
Surcharges.

Rulemaking 17-06-023

**DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO CENTER FOR
ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO
DECISION 19-01-029**

Intervenor: Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 19-01-029
Claimed: \$43,923.25	Awarded: \$43,923.25
Assigned Commissioner: Martha Guzman Aceves	Assigned ALJ: Regina DeAngelis and Zita Kline

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	Decision determining that Public Purpose Program surcharges and user fees will not be assessed on text messaging services revenue.
--	--

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812¹:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	9/13/2017	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	10/13/2017	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.18-03-011	Verified.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	1/10/10	Verified.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	See comment below.	
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.18-03-011	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	1/10/19	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	See comment below.	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes

¹ All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.19-01-029	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	2/9/2019	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	4/10/2019	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?	Yes	

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
7, 11	No ruling was issued regarding CforAT's NOI filed in this proceeding. CforAT has regularly been found to have eligible customer status and to have presented an appropriate showing of significant financial hardship so as to be eligible for compensation. The most recent ruling addressing CforAT's eligibility was issued on January 10, 2019 in R.18-03-011.	Noted.

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059):

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
Substantial Contribution Standard: CforAT's request for compensation relies on our participation in the proceeding seeking a determination that surcharges and user fees should be applied to text messaging, a result that is not adopted in the final decision. Yet, prior to the adoption of D.19-01-029, the Commission issued a proposed decision that would have taken a position strongly in keeping	While CforAT's contributions are set out in greater detail below, the relevant Proposed Decision, which was eventually withdrawn based on action taken after its issuance by the FCC, was issued on November 9, 2018. Examples of prior	Verified.

<p>with the position advocated by CforAT in conjunction with the other participating consumer groups.</p> <p>The Commission has long held that contribution to ALJ's PD is evidence of a substantial contribution, even if the Commission does not adopt the PD's recommendations. CforAT submits that the work performed by the consumers in this proceeding, which was first initiated in response to a carrier petition proceeding, was appropriate and that the arguments put forward by CforAT and the consumers contributed substantially to the Commission's consideration of the important policy issues raised in this proceeding. CforAT further submits that the eventual rejection of the consumers' position was based not on a rejection of our contributions but on changed circumstances based on FCC action.</p> <p>As illustrated in greater detail below, because the PD substantially reflects the input of CforAT and the other consumers, the Commission should find a substantial contribution warranting an award of intervenor compensation for the work CforAT incurred for our participation in the proceeding.</p> <p>CforAT also made substantial contributions to procedural matters throughout the course of the proceeding, including on matters of scope and development of the record, as addressed more fully below.</p>	<p>proceedings where the Commission has determined that a party's contribution to a proposed decision that was not eventually adopted was still sufficient to support an award of compensation include D.11-05-044, where the Commission awarded TURN substantially all of its requested compensation in a proceeding where it adopted an Alternate PD, which did not adopt TURN's recommendations, over a PD which would have done so. In awarding compensation, the Commission specifically noted that "TURN's participation ensured a thorough analysis on [the relevant issues], and their position was reflected in the PD, though not in the alternate PD, which was the final decision that was adopted. D.11-05-044 at p. 4.</p> <p>The Commission reached a similar outcome in D.13-09-041, awarding compensation to TURN based on its contributions to a proposed decision, even though it approved an alternate proposed decision which did not adopt TURN's positions. See also D.06-09-008 at p. 10 (agreeing that TURN made a substantial contribution to a proceeding "because the decision addressed issues raised by TURN and an Alternate Decision relied on several of TURN's</p>	
---	--	--

	proposals”).	
<p>Scope of Proceeding: This proceeding emerged from an initial Petition filed by CTIA asking the Commission to issue a rule “stating that text messaging services are not subject to Public Purpose Program (‘PPP’) surcharges or user fees.” Petition to Adopt, Amend, or Repeal a Regulation Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5, filed on February 27, 2017, as P.17-02-006, at p. 1. CforAT, in conjunction with TURN and the Greenlining Institute, responded to the Petition, opposed issuance of the requested rule, and addressed the broad policy basis for collecting PPP fees as well as the extent of the Commission’s jurisdiction over PPP surcharges.</p> <p>The Commission responded with an order declining to issue the rule requested by CTIA and instead opening the instant Rulemaking to address the question of whether PPP surcharges should be applied to text messaging services. The combined order/OIR reflects the importance of issues raised by the Joint Consumers in response to the CTIA Petition.</p> <p>In response to the combined order/OIR, Cox sought an expansion of the new proceeding, asking the Commission to also consider whether directory listing services are subject to PPP surcharges. CforAT, in conjunction with the other consumer advocates, opposed expansion of the new proceeding. The Commission expressly concurred with the Joint Consumers that Cox’s request was non-responsive to the Proposed Decision addressing the Petition and opening the Rulemaking, and it declined to add a review of directory listing service to the new proceeding.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the Commission’s direct rejection of Cox’s request, in subsequent</p>	<p><i>See generally</i> Response of Joint Consumers to Petition of CTIA to Adopt, Amend, or Repeal a Regulation Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code §1708.5, filed on March 29, 2017, in P.17-02-006.</p> <p>Reply Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision, filed on June 6, 2017 in P.17-02-006 (opposing addition of directory listing service to the new proceeding).</p> <p>Order Regarding Petition 17-02-006 and Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider Whether Text Messaging Services are Subject to Public Purpose Program Surcharges, issued jointly in P.17-02-006 and R.17-06-023 on July 7, 2017, at p. 12 (declining to expand scope of new proceeding).</p> <p>Reply Comments of the Center for Accessible Technology, the Greenlining Institute, and The Utility Reform Network, filed on August 28, 2017 at pp. 11-12 (opposing expansion of scope of proceeding requested by CCTA).</p> <p>Scoping Memo at pp. 2-3 (rejecting expansion of scope, consistent with the position of Joint Consumers).</p> <p>Reply Comments of the Center for Accessible Technology, the Greenlining</p>	Verified.

<p>comments CCTA requested that the Scope of the Rulemaking be expanded to include both directory listing services and voicemail. Comments of California Cable & Telecommunications Association, filed on August 18, 2018. CforAT and the other consumer advocates opposed this request. The Commission subsequently issued a Scoping Memo identifying the issues within the scope of this proceeding to only include consideration of whether text messages are subject to PPP surcharges and fees, and expressly finding that questions regarding the categorization of other services are only within the scope “to the extent it answers questions raised by” the issue of whether text messages are subject to surcharges and fees. Scoping Memo and Ruling of Assigned Commissioner (Scoping Memo), issued on October 11, 2017, at p. 3.</p> <p>Yet later in the proceeding, in comments in response to a Joint Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge issued on February 21, 2018, CCTA again attempted to bring matters regarding the treatment of voice mail and directory listings into the proceeding without acknowledging that the Commission had already declined to expand the scope on multiple occasions, and then filed an opening brief again addressing matters outside of the scope. <i>See</i> Opening Brief of CCTA filed on May 11, 2108. Joint Consumers, including CforAT, first noted the improper attempt to expand the scope in comments, and then filed a Motion to Strike those portions of the CCTA Brief addressing voicemail and directory listing services. The Motion to Strike was granted in a Ruling issued on May 25, 2018.</p>	<p>Institute, and The Utility Reform Network in Response to Joint Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge, filed on April 6, 2018 at p. 5 (addressing CCTA’s efforts to improperly expand the scope of the proceeding).</p> <p>The Center for Accessible Technology, the Greenlining Institute, and The Utility Reform Network’s Motion to Strike, filed on May 17, 2018 (seeking to strike portions of CCTA’s Opening Brief addressing issues outside of the scope of the proceeding).</p> <p>Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling Granting Motion to Strike, issued on May 25, 2018 (“affirming the Commission’s review of voicemail and directly listing services only to the extent they help the Commission determine whether text messaging should be subject to Public Purpose Program surcharges and user fees”).</p>	
<p>Record Development:</p> <p>CforAT and the other consumers sought to obtain information from carriers about</p>	<p>PHC Transcript at pp. 24:1-26:2 (discussing need to add carriers as parties to ensure</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

<p>past practices in calculating and submitting surcharges, including efforts to ensure that the carriers participated directly in the proceeding so that they could not avoid giving information by only participating through an association and by seeking information directly from the carriers.</p> <p>The Commission first ordered the carriers to join the proceeding as parties, and subsequently issued a Staff Paper that included financial data relevant to the development of the Record.</p>	<p>that factual issues can be addressed fully).</p> <p>Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Revising Communications Division Staff Paper and Public Purpose Program Financial Data, and Updating the Procedural Schedule, issued on April 25, 2018.</p>	
<p>Issue of State Law and Policy:</p> <p>(a) Consumers argued that the Commission has statutory authority to collect surcharges on intrastate texting revenue. While the final decision determines that surcharges would not be applied to text messaging services, the November PD determined in principle that the Commission should assess PPP surcharges and fees on text messaging services and relied on the reasoning put forward by consumers to do so, including an affirmation of its authority under state law;</p> <p>(b) Consumers argued that collection of surcharges on text messaging services is consistent with state policy to pursue broad support for public purpose programs;</p> <p>(c) Consumers argued that Commission precedent supports application of surcharges to text messaging services.</p>	<p>(a) Statutory Authority under California Law affirmed in November PD at pp. 25-32:</p> <p>Opening Comments of the Center for Accessible Technology, the Greenlining Institute, and the Utility Reform Network, (Opening Comments on OIR), filed on August 18, 2017 at pp. 9-11.</p> <p>Reply Comments of the Center for Accessible Technology, the Greenlining Institute, and The Utility Reform Network (Reply Comments on OIR), filed on August 28, 2017, at pp. 7-11.</p> <p>Opening Brief of the Center for Accessible Technology, the Greenlining Institute, and The Utility Reform Network in Response to Joint Ruling of Assigned</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

	<p>Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge (Opening Brief) filed on May 11, 2018, at pp. 14-18;</p> <p>Reply Brief of the Center for Accessible Technology, the Greenlining Institute, and The Utility Reform Network (Reply Brief), filed on June 5, 2018, at pp. 9-14;</p> <p>CforAT Reply Comments on November PD, filed on December 4, 2018, at pp. 3-4.</p> <p>(b) Policy in Support of Broad Collection of Fees affirmed in November PD at pp. 9-15:</p> <p>Opening Comments on OIR at pp. 11-15;</p> <p>Comments of the Center for Accessible Technology, the Greenlining Institute, and The Utility Reform Network in Response to Joint Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge (Comments on Joint Ruling), filed on March 23, 2018, at pp. 3-6;</p> <p>Reply Brief at pp. 5-9;</p> <p>CforAT Reply Comments on November PD at pp. 4-5.</p> <p>(c) Commission Precedent Supports Application of Surcharge:</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Opening Comments on OIR at pp. 14-15;</p> <p>Opening Brief at pp. 18-22.</p>	
<p>Issues of Federal Law and Policy (including jurisdiction and the classification of text messaging services):</p> <p>(a) Consumers argued that federal law does not prohibit this imposition of surcharges on text messaging services;</p> <p>(b) Consumers argued that the Commission has authority to assess surcharges on text messaging without regard to its classification as either a telecommunications service or an information service, including as part of a bundle.</p>	<p>(a) Determination that surcharging text revenue is not inconsistent with federal requirements reached in November PD at pp. 15-21, and applicability of the All End User Surcharge Mechanism for unclassified services was affirmed at pp. 32-39. Comments on OIR at pp. 7-9;</p> <p>Reply Comments on OIR at pp. 6-8.</p> <p>Comments on Joint Ruling at pp. 6-10;</p> <p>Opening Brief at pp. 6-14;</p> <p>Reply Brief at pp. 2-5</p> <p>(b) Determination that the Commission need not address classification of text messaging services in November PD at pp. 21-25.</p> <p>Comments on OIR at pp. 7-20;</p> <p>Reply Comments on OIR at pp. 6-8;</p> <p>Comments on November PD at pp. 2-5.</p>	<p>Verified.</p>
<p>Commission Retention of Authority: Following the release of the November PD, the FCC issued a ruling formally classifying text messaging as an</p>	<p>D.19-01-029 at pp. 18-19 (declining to remove section 4.1 of the December PD).</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

<p>information service. Subsequently, the Commission withdrew the November PD and issued a new Proposed Decision determining that it would not assess surcharges or user fees on text messaging revenue (the December PD).</p> <p>In comments on the December PD, CCTA requested that the Commission remove language discussing the scope of the Commission's authority to impose surcharges on non-telecommunications services. CforAT and the other consumers opposed this recommendation. The final decision, D.19-01-029, expressly declines to adopt this recommendation.</p> <p>Additionally, CTIA and the carrier parties requested that the final decision delete several findings of fact regarding past practices. The Joint Consumers argued that the findings of fact should be retained, and the Commission agreed, noting that the findings of fact "are supported by the record, factually accurate, and provide history and context to the Commission's treatment of text messaging revenue."</p> <p>In declining to adopt these changes, the Commission implicitly recognized the value of the consumer's contributions to this proceeding in setting out the full record of the issue and adding depth to the Commission's analysis.</p>	<p>D.19-01-029 at pp. 19-20 (declining to delete Findings of Fact 2 & 3).</p> <p>Joint Consumers Reply Comments on December PD, filed on January 15, 2019, at pp. 1-5.</p>	
--	--	--

B. Duplication of Effort (§ 1801.3(f) and § 1802.5):

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Public Advocate's Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding? ²	No	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Greenlining Institute, TURN (The Utility Reform Network)		Verified
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: CforAT has worked diligently and collaboratively with the other consumers (TURN and Greenlining) to reduce or avoid duplication of effort by coordinating closely and by jointly drafting and filing all but one substantive submission in this proceeding. The lone document that was filed separately by CforAT, our Reply Comments on the November PD, was developed in close coordination with TURN and Greenlining, who jointly addressed separate issues raised in the November PD. In preparing joint filings, CforAT, TURN and Greenlining routinely assigned the task of creating an initial draft of various sections of the document among the different organizations. CforAT regularly took the lead in addressing issues of state policy. CforAT also worked with the other organizations to review and integrate all sections of each document and ensure that all consumer concerns were appropriately addressed. To the extent the Commission finds there was any duplication of effort, CforAT urges a determination that such duplication was minimal and that it reflected coordination as necessary to effectively address broad consumer concerns.		Agreed. CforAT did not engage in excessive duplication.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806):**

	CPUC Discussion
a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness: The Joint Consumers, including CforAT, worked diligently in this proceeding to support the longstanding policy determination of the	Verified.

² The Office of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Public Advocate's Office of the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to Senate Bill No. 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018.

<p>Commission that public purpose programs should be supported based on the broadest possible assessment of surcharges and fees. While the final decision adopted by the Commission did not adopt the consumers' position, this was not based on a rejection of our contribution, but rather on changed circumstances based by late action by the FCC. Prior to this action by the FCC, the Commission issued a proposed decision that would have taken a position in keeping with the position advocated by CforAT and the other consumers, and even after the FCC decision, the Commission declined to strike accurate information about the legal and policy positions adopted previously.</p> <p>While there is no clear way to assign a dollar value to the outcome, policymakers and consumers will benefit generally from the Commission's broad review of funding sources and methods for assessing PPP surcharges as informed by the perspective of the Joint Consumers. In light of this evaluation, initiated first by the CTIA Petition than on the Commission's own determination, the compensation requested by CforAT is reasonable.</p>	
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>As noted above with regard to duplication of effort, CforAT participated effectively in this proceeding while investing a reasonable commitment of resources by working in conjunction with other consumer advocates on all issues. In our NOI, CforAT estimated that we would spend 120 hours of time by counsel in this proceeding. In fact, we spent fewer than 90 hours, which included responding to repeated efforts by carrier parties to expand the scope of the proceeding as well as necessary work to obtain access to relevant financial data. In addition, CforAT and the other consumer advocates worked diligently to address an array of complex legal and policy issues at both the state and federal level in order to ensure that the Commission had a detailed basis on which to make its decision. Overall, the contributions of the consumers, including CforAT, were made efficiently and the overall number of hours invested in this proceeding were used efficiently.</p>	Verified.
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>CforAT allocated time spent by counsel among various issues over time as described below:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2017 Time (27.0 hours total)</p> <p>General Participation: 5.5 hours (20.4%)</p> <p>The issue area "General Participation" includes time spent on procedural matters and time spent on activities that do not fall into the other issue categories. In particular, time allocated as "General Participation" in</p>	Verified.

2017 includes time spent responding to the combined Proposed Decision in the predecessor Petition Proceeding (P.17-02-006) and draft OIR. CforAT notes that Rule 17.4(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure allows an intervenor to include "reasonable costs of participation in a proceeding that were incurred prior to the start of the proceeding." CforAT is not seeking compensation for time in the Petition proceeding other than for comments on the joint PD/Draft OIR.

Record: 1.7 hours (6.3%)

The issue area "Record" includes time spent addressing matters of discovery and the development of the factual record in this proceeding. This includes time spent addressing a motion to suspend the schedule while seeking carrier financial data and time addressing data provided by the Commission.

Scope: 3.9 hours (14.4%)

The issue area "Scope" includes time spent addressing the appropriate scope of the proceeding, including work opposing multiple efforts by carrier parties to expand the scope and a Motion to Strike matters outside of the scope.

State: 5.5 hours (20.4%)

The issue area "State" includes time spent addressing substantive matters of state law and policy with regard to the surchargability of text messaging services. As noted above, when the Joint Consumers allocated issues among themselves for drafting, CforAT generally took the lead on issues of state policy.

Mix: 10.4 hours (38.5%)

The issue area "Mix" is used for most time entries spent drafting substantive comments, because the substantial majority of filings include more than one issue area. While CforAT could sort out entries where we drafted our assigned section as addressing primarily state issues, time spent on the combined document represents a review of all substantive issues of state and federal law and policy, with limited additional work addressing the proceeding's scope and record. Given CforAT's primary focus on the state elements, we would allocate the time within the category of "Mix" as follows: State – 50%; Federal: 35%; Scope: 10%; Record: 5%. In 2018/2019, CforAT has a small number of separate entries for the issue area "Federal," but we have no such entries in 2017.

2018/2019 Time (60.5 hours)

See Comment below

Federal: 2.0 hours (3.3%)

The issue area "federal" includes time spent addressing substantive

matters of federal law and policy with regard to the surchargability of text messaging services. CforAT has limited separate entries addressing federal issues, because these issues were most often assigned to the other consumer groups for initial drafting.

General Participation: 3.5 hours (5.8%)

Record: 4.7 hours (7.8%)

Scope: 6.7 hours (11.1%)

State: 16.7 hours (27.6%)

Mix: 26.9 hours (44.5%)

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2017	27.0	\$465	D.17-11-031	\$12,555.00	27.0	\$465	\$12,555.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2018-2019	60.5	\$475	D.18-11-049	\$28,737.50	60.5	\$475	\$28,737.50
Subtotal: \$ 41292.50						Subtotal: \$41,292.50		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2017	1.1	\$232.5	½ approved rate	\$255.75	1.1	\$232.50	\$255.75
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2018-2019	10.0	\$237.5	½ approved rate	\$2,375.00	10.0	\$237.50	\$2,375.00
Subtotal: \$2630.75						Subtotal: \$2,630.75		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$ 43923.25						TOTAL AWARD: \$43,923.25		
*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs								

for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.

**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate

ATTORNEY INFORMATION

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ³	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Melissa W. Kasnitz	December, 1992	162679	No, but includes periods of "inactive" status prior to 1997

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	CforAT Time Records (includes merits time and time spent on compensation)
Comment on 2019 Time	Because CforAT conducted very limited substantive work on the merits in 2019, we are seeking compensation for such time at 2018 rates (and ½ 2018 rates for work on compensation). We reserve the right to seek compensation for work done in other proceedings in 2019 based on the COLA adopted in Resolution ALJ-375 (2.35%, which would result in a 2019 rate for Melissa W. Kasnitz of \$490).

³ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

D. PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff or any other party may file a response to the Claim (*see* § 1804(c))

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Center for Accessible Technology has made a substantial contribution to Decision 19-01-029.
2. The requested hourly rates for Center for Accessible Technology's representatives are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$43,923.25.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. Center for Accessible Technology shall be awarded \$43,923.25.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, the California Public Utilities Commission Intervenor Compensation Fund shall pay Center for Accessible Technology the total award. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning June 24, 2019, the 75th day after the filing of Center for Accessible Technology's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at Los Angeles, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision:	D1901029		
Proceeding:	R1706023		
Author:	ALJs Kline and DeAngelis		
Payer:	CPUC Intervenor Compensation Fund		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Center for Accessible Technology	April 10, 2019	\$43,923.25	\$43,923.25	N/A	N/A

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$465	2017	\$465
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$475	2018-19	\$475

(END OF APPENDIX)